UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Labor Needs a God

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

Comments from Geneva

Who Is the "Villain" in the Drama?

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Conviction of a Vegetarian

By J. WALTER SCHIRMER

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 5

Chicago, April 4, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. EDNA R. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 67
Labor Needs a God—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE 70
Jottings—J. H. H 72
ARTICLES—
Comments from Geneva—Who Is the "Villain" in the Drama?—SYDNEY STRONG 73
The Conviction of a Vegetarian—J. WALTER SCHIRMER 75
POETRY—
Trade of Death—REGINALD REYNOLDS 67
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Any City—JESSIE WILMORE MURTON 74
Gold Seekers—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 74
Smug Household—HENRIETTE W. ROBERTS 74
They Worked at Your Side—HENRY E. SWENSEN 75
To a Poet—ISIDORE GOODMAN 75
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Rabbi Turns Author—JENNIE FRANKLIN PURVIN 77
Parables and Sayings—J. H. H 78
CORRESPONDENCE—
"Declaration of an American Citizen"—EUGENE W. SUTHERLAND 78
For Norman Thomas—E. T. GUEST 78
Money and Debts—F. S. KINDER 79
Ireland and India—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 79
THE FIELD—
The Use of Lathis—PETER FREEMAN 66
Agree or Perish—*The Arbitrator* 79
What Gandhi Wants for India—*Linley V. Gordon* 80
Sydney Strong Back from Geneva 80
Recognition for Dr. Sunderland 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Use of Lathis

A First-Hand Personal Eye-Witness Statement by Peter Freeman (ex-M.P.)

I was going along Mount Road, the main street of Madras, about 4 o'clock today when I saw on the other side of the road about a dozen Indians walking quietly along, one of their number carrying a flag. On inquiry I was informed they were members of the Congress. Such action is illegal in India, so that when they reached a policeman, it was taken out of his hand and without further ado the police officer started hitting him repeatedly with a heavy *lathi* as hard as he could hit on every part of his body, including many blows on his head. The man was knocked down and became unconscious, after a short time, but the rain of blows continued even while he was lying helpless on the ground. By this time, a car-load of about 20 additional police had arrived, all armed with heavy *lathis*. Other members of the little group were then attacked and beaten mercilessly, but without any kind of retaliation from the Congressmen. In one case the man's nerve gave way, and he attempted to run away, but was chased by four or five of the police officers and hit ruthlessly on every part of his body including his head. How he was able to stand the heavy blows without losing consciousness I do not know, though he attempted to ward off the blows with his bare arms, but with little effect. Eventually, he was able to escape and made his way amongst the crowd.

No aggressive attitude had been shown by any of the members of the little procession, and no kind of counter attack was made. No crowd had collected. No inquiry was made, no attempt to arrest these men was carried out at the time, though other members of the group subsequently were arrested. No threats were made to the police, and there was no danger of any kind of attack, as every member of the group was warned and walked quietly and peacefully along until stopped.

To their shame, four English sergeants were present, and rather encouraged than otherwise this deliberate and brutal treatment of untried, harmless citizens. If they had committed an illegal act, they could have been arrested, tried and if guilty whatever punishment was necessary, properly administered by the proper authority.

But for the police to have the power to take the law into their own hands and use such cruel and brutal methods, is a denial of every sense of justice and fair play which is the back-bone of English traditions and humanity. Posterity will class such brutalities as worse than the Black-hole of Calcutta, and the burning of Joan of Arc. How long must they continue?

Even in warfare, no one would attack an unarmed defenseless man in

(*Continued on page* 79)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1932 Number 5

TRADE OF DEATH

Like white gulls laden with their wares
Golden galleons and corsairs
Robbed or robbing, sold and bought,
Tacked and traded, fled or fought.

But even when the game was done
Man had lost—the Sea had won:
In one bed with the pirate lies
The merchant with his merchandise.

Vainly of her virginity
Our proud steel prows have made them free:
The great grey ships of death have made
Another boom in the Sea's trade.

REGINALD REYNOLDS.

A lot of light is shed on the reluctance of the western powers to interfere with the Sino-Japanese conflict by the reports of the business boom this conflict has brought to Europe. For the first time in years, business is looking up, thanks to huge orders for military supplies from both China and Japan. Britain, aided by the low cost of the pound sterling, is feeling the quickest and largest measure of prosperity. Her airplane factories for example, are working overtime for the Mikado. In France, the Japanese are buying machine-guns, and light and heavy artillery units. Germany is manufacturing munitions and explosives in huge quantities. But this is not all! For both the Japanese and the Chinese, according to well authenticated reports, are placing large orders for textiles and woolen cloth in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. The artillery division of the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia has orders from the East for artillery parts. It is well known, of course, that the French Schneider Creusot Company has a fifty per cent interest in the Skoda works. All of which means that for the moment at least, Europe is being kept alive commercially and financially by the Asiatic embroilment! Indeed, if the Sino-Japanese war could only be turned into a really first-class conflict, and thus kept raging some three or four years, or more, like the World War, Europe would find therein the solution of all her economic difficulties, at least for the time being. War, in other words, is initially profitable—to those, at least, outside the area of conflict. It creates business by opening an enormous market for arms, munitions and machinery, and by destroying incalculable totals of wealth which must be promptly replaced if the world is to survive. What wonder that the European powers didn't want to stop the Asiatic conflict too soon! How obvious that every nation, east and west, is beset by interests which regard war, and preparedness for war, as a condition of prosperity, and peace as an economic disaster of the first magnitude. Of course, this is a superficial judgment. Norman Angell has shown conclusively that, in this highly complex modern age, war in the end must be the ruin of us all. That any nation, or any interest, anywhere, can long prosper out of war is "the great illusion." But few people yet see it—and no statesmen! Hence the peril, which still confronts our destiny, of war tolerated, or even encouraged, for the sake of the quick profits it may yield to a few highly capitalized industries.

There are things that happen occasionally in this world that tend to make us convert again to Browning's easy-going optimism that

> God's in his heaven,
> All's right with the world.

One of these came along a fortnight ago when the House of Representatives took the bit in its teeth and ran away with the tax bill. If something of this sort had not occurred—if an explosion had not somewhere appeared, in Washington or in the country at large—we think we would have lost hope for the universe. For if ever a bill was an outrage upon a long-suffering people, it was this tax bill. Here was the government faced with the problem of meeting a deficit of something like two billion dollars, and thus balancing the budget. The simple, sure, just way of

doing this was of course to raise the income tax progressively in the higher grades, place impost charges upon stock sales and bank clearings, hold corporations more rigorously to full returns on business, etc. But did the political leaders follow any such policy as this? Not for a moment! Anxious, especially the Democrats grooming themselves for support in the approaching campaign, not to offend the rich or alienate the financial powers of the land, the two-party machines joined hands in slapping on a 2¼ per cent sales tax which the rich would not feel at all, but which would raise the cost of living for the great masses of the people by at least 5 to 10 per cent. They did this, we presume, on the easy supposition that the citizens of this country will stand for anything. There is reason for assuming this—haven't we stood a winter of semi-starvation and misery with the government doing nothing except for banks and money-lenders, and uttered never a "yip"? But there is a limit to all things, even to the patience of Americans, and this limit evidently came with the sales tax. Almost without warning, revolt was in the saddle, and the party machines of Congress in precipitate flight. How far things will go, we dare not prophecy. But whatever happens, or does not happen, we are feeling good. The people are at last stirring from their inertia, and will soon be wide awake.

Something over a year ago there died in New York an aged maiden lady by the name of Miss Wendell. This deceased was the last of a group of brothers and sisters who had accumulated enormous properties and now left no direct heirs. Miss Wendell's will, a remarkable document, bequeathed the bulk of her wealth to designated educational and religious institutions. Immediately after her death, however, distant relatives began to appear and make claims. These relatives have now multiplied to scores, claims have developed into legal suits; and litigation will probably continue for years and in the end consume a good portion of the property. A few weeks ago there died in the old Herald Square Hotel, in New York, a certain aged widow, Mrs. Wood. For years she had been a recluse, known by the hotel attachés as "queer." In due time a nephew was appointed as her legal guardian to safeguard her interests, and in the course of a casual examination of her apartment found more than $900,000 in cash hidden away in all kinds of curious places. On her death she left an estate valued at several million dollars. And of course the inevitable "relatives" are now beginning to appear—nephews, nieces, cousins, never heard of before, but undubitably connected with this woman who died possessed of so much money. Business in this case is promised to the courts for years to come. When George Eastman, the "kodak" millionaire, shot himself the other day, it was carefully explained that he was a bachelor, and, aside from a certain niece, who attended his funeral, left no heirs. Within twenty-four hours of his death, however, there appeared in New York City a George Eastman who described himself as a nephew of the Rochester manufacturer. He told to the newspaper reporters a fantastic yarn about his father, a brother of the "kodak" man, having run away from home as a boy, then been ashamed to claim his kinship after George's great success, etc., etc. The tale is absurd, but it will support some smart lawyer for the rest of his life. All of which raises the question as to why there should be any such thing as a law of inheritance! Why should relatives to the eighth, tenth, or twelfth remove, have legal claims upon property left by a person whom they never knew or saw, and for whom they never did a kindly deed? We understand the justice of wives having certain rights as regards husbands, and husbands as regards wives. Aged parents and minor children should not be neglected. But even in these cases of immediate kinship, inheritance should be strictly limited, and beyond these should not be recognized at all. The spectacle of anybody who can prove any slightest blood relationship having a claim upon property left by the dead, is to us as preposterous as it is indecent. Under the law as we would have it, a person might bequeath certain limited amounts of property to designated individuals and institutions. Then all the rest of the estate would revert automatically to the state!

Is Will Rogers slipping? This hardly seems likely. Yet the American jester has made some "slips" lately which are surprising, and which bode ill for the future if not speedily retrieved. It is well known, of course, that Will Rogers has never had the surety of taste and judgment which characterized that immortal wit of a generation ago, "Mr. Dooley." The sage philosopher of Archey Road was astonishingly wise, not only shrewd but reverent, and unfailingly restrained even in the most extravagant fantasies of his public humor. Looking back upon the period in which he reigned, we find no recollection of any single mistake ever committed by this Irish bartender. But this is not true of Will Rogers. Enjoying in the beginning no such training as that which came to Finley Peter Dunn, almost inevitably spoiled by unprecedented triumphs in circus-tents, theatres, newspapers, colleges, chancellories, and the courts of kings, Rogers was not as sure with his tongue as he was with his lariat. His incredible *faux pas* in imitating President Coolidge over the radio, and thus holding up to ridicule the first citizen of the land, was quickly forgiven but will not soon be forgotten. Errors not as egregious as this, but of the same type, have been multiplying alarmingly of late. There was his ghastly jesting,

for example, over the fighting in China, which showed him utterly oblivious of the horrors suffered by millions of innocent men, women and children in this most dreadful and needless of all international conflicts. As though one instance of such offense were not enough, Will Rogers promptly repeated when he reached Geneva, and there began making sport of the Disarmament Conference which brought shock and sorrow to millions of faithful peace-makers throughout the world. But Rogers' worst mistake was made on the occasion of the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby. At such a time, perhaps, it was easy to tumble into some gross extravagance or wild ferocity. Yet Will Rogers has surely been before the public long enough to develop some idea of responsibility, and should have been perhaps the last man in the country to go mad. And yet it was none other than this usually wise and witty man who urged the organization of a lynching-party to seize and kill upon the spot the stealers of the little child at Hopewell! What is the matter with Rogers that he should begin suddenly to "slip" in this fashion? Has he been praised too long and too much? Has he lost that fine sense of proportion which is the secret of all sanity? Is his humility, once his most attractive quality, being corrupted into an arrogance which tempts him to believe that he is not merely a jester but a statesman? Rogers has never taken the world, nor anybody in it, seriously. Is he now actually proceeding to take *himself* seriously? This seems to us to be perilously near the actual truth. Where is the good friend who will take Will Rogers quietly aside some day, and remind him that he is still simply a merry joke, that's all?

Readers of UNITY will probably be irritated to find reference again in these columns to the insufferable American architect, Mr. Whitney Warren, and his infamous inscription for his Louvain Library building, but will be quickly consoled, we trust, by the prompt assurance that this is positively the last time this dishonored name will ever be mentioned here. We have followed, step by step, the developments of this Louvain affair because of its close bearing upon the whole problem of war psychology, and also because of the great importance of a right outcome. That outcome has now happily and finally been attained. It will be remembered that the trouble all began over the selection of Whitney Warren to be the architect of the new Library building erected at Louvain by American donors to take the place of the historic structure destroyed by the Germans. The designs provided a building of monumental ugliness, of which the crowning and incredible horror was a huge Latin inscription, running the entire length of a front balustrade, which read (in translations), "Destroyed by German Fury; Restored by American Generosity." To the everlasting credit of the Louvain University authorities, be it said, that they refused to allow this inscription to be put in place. They had no desire, they explained, to have their library used as a cheap means of perpetuating the war hatreds of which all men were now happily ashamed. Furthermore, American friends of sane sentiment and good taste were quick to point out that "generosity" was no longer generosity but vainglory when it advertised itself in letters several feet high, especially at the expense of another people. So, from both sides, on grounds incontrovertible, came appeals to the architect to modify his design by removing this humiliating billboard inscription. But Mr. Whitney Warren jeered at the idea. Who were these Louvain scholars, that they should have anything to say about what was to appear on the walls of their own library? Who were these American donors, that they should be consulted upon the terms of their own gift? No, this Whitney Warren, with his impoisoned anti-Germanism, his inflated pro-Americanism, his execrable bad taste, this man, the architect bought and paid for, would settle this question, and everybody else go hang. But fortunately there are courts of justice in Belgium, and these at last took charge of the problem, and now at last have settled it. Whitney Warren or no Whitney Warren, the inscription will not be erected. And so a question which any gentleman could have answered in an hour, is now answered by judges for all time to come.

Albert Bushnell Hart, official historian of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, is saying ridiculous things about the "Father of His Country," perhaps because it is the business of the official historian of a celebration committee to speak forth foolishness. It would seem as though Professor Hart, however, were old enough and learned enough to escape the pitfalls of fulsome flattery. Yet here do we find him quoted as saying that Washington "was the most voluminous writer of his day and the most effective writer of his time." There would seem to be no necessity for exaggeration of this kind in the case of the great Virginian. For surely he is great enough to hold his fame without claims to achievement not his own. Washington "the most voluminous writer of his day"? More voluminous than Benjamin Franklin, for example? Or Goethe? And "the most effective writer of his time"? More "effective" than Voltaire and Edmund Burke? But perhaps Professor Hart is thinking only of Americans! Then, more "effective" than Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry? If so, why was it the words of these men which kindled the hearts of the colonists as with fire, and not the words of Washington? More "effective" than Thomas Paine? Then how happened it that as sound a literary judge as Franklin declared that "others can

rule, many can fight, but only Thomas Paine can write for us the English tongue"? More "effective" than Thomas Jefferson? Then why was Jefferson and not Washington invited to write the Declaration of Independence, which was to do with words what the Continental Army was doing with swords? More "effective" than James Madison and Alexander Hamilton? Then why was it left to these two young men, and not to the older and more influential Washington, to defend and commend the new Constitution in the pages of the *Federalist?* Professor Hart, carried away by a bicentennial enthusiasm which finds it necessary to ascribe supremacy to Washington in every field, has said here what is obviously untrue. George Washington, in the course of a long and crowded career, did a great deal of unavoidable writing. But, relatively speaking, he was not "voluminous," and from no standpoint was he "effective." On the contrary, he was peculiarly awkward in style, as he was always halting in speech. As a matter of fact, Washington was not a writer at all, nor yet an orator. He simply didn't function in these fields. He would have been the first to disclaim the honors so fatuously bestowed upon him by his official historian.

Labor Needs a God

Labor needs a God. Not the conventional God, not the God who is far away and merely of philosophical interest. It is not that God Labor needs. It needs an ethical God. It needs the God proclaimed by Amos and Isaiah and by Jesus, the God of the poor and the oppressed, the God of Moses who was determined to lead his people out of slavery.

This statement will be sharply challenged by the hundred per cent Marxian, by the communist who says that religion is the opiate of the people. Nevertheless we repeat it. Labor needs such an ethical God if its cause is to triumph and its victory to be made permanent. There are weighty reasons for this statement.

First of all, the belief in this kind of a God is needed by Labor because the real choice is not what so many of our radical friends apparently believe. The real choice is not between belief in this moral and ethical God and utter rejection of any concept of God. Man is incurably religious. He is going to have some kind of a God. I remember an atheist friend who in my college days worked hard to uproot the idea of God in the minds of all he could influence. A few years after I found that he had given up his propaganda work. I asked him why and he replied that he had found that wherever he was able to overthrow the orthodox Christian conception of God the atheist substitute he offered did not last for long. It almost inevitably resulted in folks turning to New Thought, to spiritualism, to Christian Science, to crystal gazing or some other less popular religion. He had come, he said, to see that the real choice was not between the orthodox God and no God but it was merely a choice of what kind of God. An article in a recent number of *Harpers* called "The Heydey of the Fortune Tellers" shows the actual result of the loss of vital religious faith. That result is not a belief in philosophical materialism and atheism. It is just fortune telling. This becomes increasingly evident even in countries avowedly atheistic. Revolutionary Russia will find as did revolutionary France that belief in some form of God cannot be permanently swept aside. The more one tries to escape God the more impossible the task becomes as Francis Thompson so skilfully portrays in his Hound of Heaven. Churches can be destroyed and religious movements broken up and perhaps for a generation or two men may seem to live without God. But that cannot go on for long. God will come back because man cannot do without him. At least one keen observer in Russia in the past year has reported that some of the younger communists are talking in terms of economic determinism as a law that is written in the very heart of things. They are finding cosmic support for the changes they are striving to bring about. This seeking for cosmic support for the realization of the ideal is certainly a long step towards religion and God. Labor is bound to have a God whether we like it or don't like it and faced with this fact economic radicals could help their cause by pointing out that the real God is the God of justice, the God of the workers, the God who is on their side against every form of injustice and domination. Why can we not recognize the value of using this ineradicable tendency to believe in God as an ally in our fight for a better human society rather than engage in a futile attempt to drive out a part of human nature which cannot be driven out?

Again, Labor needs a God because it is tremendously important that Labor cease to waste any of its time and energy in attacks upon any and all religion. If there is any one thing which is holding back the whole radical movement here in the United States it is the silly and senseless attack which some of its leaders feel called upon to make upon religion. Bring that issue into the miners struggles in Harlan, Kentucky, and instantly public sentiment is lost for the just cause of the strikers. An effective handle is given to those who want to destroy the entire labor movement. Bring this issue into labor propaganda as is done repeatedly and the task is made doubly hard in

getting men and women to see the injustices of our present economic system. Man after man is prejudiced against the whole labor cause just because it has seemed necessary to some of the leaders, in the radical wing at least, to go out of their way to declare that atheism and economic justice are practically one and the same. Just because materialism seemed a plausible view of the universe in the days of Marx and Engels and the churches seemed against economic justice why perpetuate their attitude when it is no longer a tenable position and only serves to alienate those that must be won if Labor is to prevail? Why not instead point out to the Jew that the communist ideal of rewarding men on the basis of need and requiring from them on the basic of ability was also the ideal of his great prophets? And why not point out to the Christian that this was the goal held up by Jesus? Why not quote the brilliant disciple of the Galilean carpenter, Paul, "If any will not work neither shall he eat."

Also, Labor needs a God because of the driving power that is found in the belief in a God of righteousness. Think of the Hebrew people toiling as slaves making bricks in Egypt. Think of their deliverance at the hands of Moses because of the power of the idea which Moses brought them. He told them of the moral God, of the ethical God who had surely seen the suffering of his people and had come to deliver them. It was this mighty faith which made it possible for them to escape from the hand of the Pharaohs and find their way to a better land. Think too of the tremendous drive that was in the Moslem religion in the days of Mohammed and his successors. Those Moslem armies were irresistible not so much because of their careful military organizations, for there was much to be desired in that respect, but because of the power of the idea. Their religion gave these men a fervor and a capacity to endure all kinds of hardships that is sadly needed by the American Labor movement. Think too of the early Christians who were an insignificant group of humble folk but who nevertheless shook the Roman Empire to its very foundations. Again it was the spur of religion, their faith in God that gave them their power. Think too of the Puritans who had the courage to forsake their homes and come to the bleak shores of New England. It was religion and their firm confidence in a God of righteousness that gave them this power. Remember too that about the only communist communities in our own land that have been successful to any real degree have been those based upon religious faith. But possibly as clear an illustration of the power of religious faith almost literally to remove mountains is found in the mighty trek of the Mormons to Great Salt Lake. Read the history of that little group who were hated by their fellow citizens far more bitterly than communists are hated today and see how these brave men with practically nothing but their religious faith were able to blaze their way across the wilderness. See them as they make their way among the Indians. See them as they overcome every kind of natural obstacle. See them as they settle in the desert and make it bloom like the rose. See them finally as they set up a new state and become a power which the United States government itself was careful not to offend, at least not much. What these men had was their religious faith. It is not necessary to say that they were right in all that they believed and did and we do not say that but we do say that their religious faith was what gave them the mighty driving power which was the wonder of our country.

Think too not merely of movements like that of the Mormons and the others we have just mentioned but think also of the men today who are battling for the rights and well being of their fellows. I know something of the religious faith that lies back of so many of these lives. There is Kagawa out there in Japan living in the slums, sacrificing himself and all that he has for the workers of that land. I have seen him and I know of the belief in a God of righteousness and kindness that moves him to do what he does. There is Albert Schweitzer, one of the world's greatest authorities on and interpreters of Bach, one of the world's greatest physicians too, and one of the world's great philosophers giving himself to the African savages, erecting his own hospital and raising his own funds to carry on his work. It is lives like these that faith in the real God makes possible. We crave that kind of energy, that kind of zeal for the Labor movement. So we say Labor needs a God to give it the flaming zeal that will bring in the better world which is its avowed aim. By neglecting religion Labor neglects the greatest source of energy we know.

Further, Labor needs religion to give it personal morality. To bring in the social revolution, to usher in the new day when all shall share and none shall want there is needed a much larger supply of incorruptible men. Of what use is it to collect funds for the strikers if some labor man is going to pocket those funds? We are not saying that this often happens but we know that it does happen for we read in the communist press words of bitter censure concerning the young communists who sell magazines and papers and appropriate the proceeds to their own use. A belief in the ethical God is a strong enforcement to honesty and fair dealing. And Labor needs this reinforcement. What is the tenor of the criticism of the A. F. of L. if it is not precisely along this line? What is the talk about conditions in the moving picture operators' union if it is not of this kind? Moreover we read in the communist press that there is the utmost laxity about comrades promising to speak at meetings

and then failing to show up, merely pleading that they are busy. We agree as all must that such dilatoriness, such lack of responsibility is most reprehensible. Here again there is need for the individual personal virtues which alone can make possible the movement which will overthrow existing injustice. These virtues can be best maintained by a belief in an ethical God. Whatever failure Christian churches have made they have at least made thousands of men who will swear to their own hurt.

And finally Labor needs a God to give it staying power. Capitalism is not going to be overthrown today or tomorrow or this year or next. There are years of struggle ahead. Reaction will probably be in the saddle. Labor needs a faith that will keep it from getting discouraged when the strikes are crushed and the labor press destroyed, when the years come and there is no pleasure in them. Faith in a righteous God gives the complete assurance that victory is with the masses. It gives the guarantee that Labor will win. It gives the assurance that the powers of the universe are on our side in this struggle. We need this assurance. In the Labor movement today there are those who have something of this confidence in victory through their faith in the iron laws of economic determinism and the inevitable passing of capitalism. Here is the beginning of a religious faith. Why not go on and have it fully and completely? Why not go on and say that we who believe in the cause of Labor know that the very creative spirit of the universe is on our side?

So we maintain that not only is God an objective reality and must be reckoned with by Labor but that the idea of God is pragmatically valuable to Labor. It is valuable to Labor because men will have religion whether or no and it is important for the Labor movement that they have a religion which makes them intolerant of oppression. Second, Labor needs a God because it is wasting too much good energy in fighting sham religious battles. And third, Labor needs a God because of the tremendous driving power of the idea. And fourth it needs God because it needs men of strong fearless character, the kind of men that historically have been made by the prophetic religion of both Judaism and Christianity. And finally, Labor needs God to give it staying power in the long and hard battle ahead. It is for these reasons that we would urge the men in power in the Labor movement, certainly the radical section of it, to cease spending their time in a futile battle against religion but rather unite with those who in both Judaism and Christianity will give themselves with just as much self sacrifice as Labor leaders to bring in the social revolution. May they remember that there is a rapidly growing group of men in the church who are with them in their struggle. Why can they not get rid of this materialistic dogma which hangs like an old man of the sea upon the back of forward looking labor men? May they realize that in the kind of religion which serves an ethical God, the God who desires truth and righteousness rather than sacrifice, Labor has the most powerful weapon yet forged to overthrow the existing institutions of oppression. In the prophetic religion of Amos and Jesus there is enough social dynamite to blow up every institution which now delays the coming of a decent human society.

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

Jottings

Unemployment in England has increased from 9.7 per cent in 1927 to 21.3 per cent in 1931. Since January 1st the sum of unemployment has been steadily rising, and has now swamped the slight recovery after Britain went off the gold standard. Wasn't MacDonald's statesmanship just wonderful? And what's the future of the British Empire?

"Slum" and "slump." Do these words have a common derivation? Probably not! But—one-third of the people of the United States live in slums, and have no purchasing power. And doesn't this cause slumps?

The Pope's new railroad in the Vatican is only 600 feet long, but "it has," we are told, "one of the world's finest trains—of a magnificence unsurpassed." Which reminds us that, when Jesus went up to Jerusalem, he walked!

The adjournment of the Disarmament Conference for a month is fair subject for jest. How can a conference adjourn from doing nothing? But there are amazing miracles being wrought in this modern age. Perhaps minus-nothing (adjournment) added to nothing (session) may bring something. At any rate, the Conference when adjourned can't do less than when it was in session.

Which is worse—bank robberies or bank failures? In the former case, there is at least evidence that there is something in the banks to take away.

DEFINITIONS: (7) *Politics.* Public plunder for private profit.

J. H. H.

Comments from Geneva

Who Is the "Villain" in the Drama?

[From Our Special Correspondent]

February 25th will be an unforgetable day in my life. I was seated high-up in the Glass-House, Geneva, looking down upon the General Commission of the Conference, as it was about to take up the detail work of reduction of armament. One side of this beautiful room is like a huge pane of glass, and through it can plainly be seen the blue water of the lake, and the towering mountains beyond. The room was packed —there being about 150 delegates composing the Commission, 150 reporters, 150 eager spectators. The machinery was now to get under way for the purpose of solving the armament problem. It was to mean many weeks of work. Some of the leading statesmen of earth were there for this important beginning of an enterprise which might end in confusion, or might bring needed relief,—Tardieu, Simon, Grandi, Litvinoff—representatives of over fifty nations. (So far as I know, none of the delegates carried arms, pleasant contrast to a similar assembly that might have been convened 1000 A. D.).

Two matters of business occupied the first day: (1) the establishment of the method of procedure, (2) the naming of committees to work on questions of the air, the army, the navy and budgets. The establishment of the method of procedure introduced as dramatic a scene as I have ever witnessed, attended with a deep stirring of emotions. Simon of England moved that the Draft Convention—which a commission had been preparing for several years—be made the frame-work for business. It was finally adopted. Before this was done, however, several hours were spent in discussing the proposal of Litvinoff, that the "Conference base its work on the principle of general and complete disarmament." The argument for it ran this way:

"Security against war can only be secured by the total abolition of arms and all sorts of other military factors."

"The only guarantee of security for all nations would be equality in disarmament, in the reduction to zero."

In an impassioned appeal the speaker invited the delegates to join in a great disarmament plan which speedily might be made complete. His pleadings and warnings found a sanction in the booming of guns in Shanghai!

Well, what happened when that promising Peace Proposal—like a rainbow—hung for several hours over the Wise Men of the World? I watched it there all this time, fascinated as though heaven were kissing earth—and what better place than right here? I could hardly withhold crying out, "Awake, ye men, the golden dream of peace has come true! You have but to reach out your hands and bring it down." I would have done this, but a big sign read, "No demonstrations." I said—but my lips were sealed—Men, stand up and cheer, and sing, Peace is here!

The speaker sat down. It had been hard work, for he was conscious of an atmosphere of skepticism. The scribes, lawyers and diplomats were not looking encouragement! The chairman looked about as to say, who will speak? Then up rose Tevfik of Turkey, "In favor of it, provided it implies equality." Then Sepahbodi of Persia, "Glad if proposals were accepted." Then Nadolny of Germany, "Sympathetic." Politis of Greece began to pour cold water, "Must first have confidence. This proposal would interfere with important matters of reduction and disarmament." Madariaga of Spain tried to harmonize Simon and Litvinoff, but failed. Then a recess of two hours for luncheon. All this noon hour time, the proposal involving total disarmament hung over earth, where all the nations had gathered. And this proposal may not come back for centuries! The Great Avenger turns not back!

Then a vote was taken. "All who favor the making the principle of general and complete disarmament the basis of work for the Conference will make a show of hands." The sunshine was flooding the room at the time. How many hands went up? Two! And these two? The hand of Litvinoff, from the land, sometimes described as "Godless"; and the hand of Tevfik, from the land of Turkey. People once referred to the "unspeakable Turk"! And the hands of all the others went up against the proposal for total disarmament! Many from Christian lands. What a scene! Peace came again to earth—and there was no room in the inn! "He came unto his own, and his own knew him not." God still travels incognito. A Great Peace Proposal knocked for admission at the door of the Peace House—and he was turned away, because the keepers of the door would not recognize him. What a tragedy! And the Great Refusal goes on forever, bearing its consequences of war's woes.

And who is to blame for this tragedy? Who is the "villain" in this disarmament play? I am frank to say that it belongs to the English-speaking nations. If Simon and Gibson and Perley and Water and Wilford and Ryrie and Lester had had the strength to break from the mummy-clothes of fear and tradition, and declared, That Peace Proposal sounds like the Sermon on the Mount—we are for it first and last, it would have gone over with a bang. Instead, mankind is left to taper off in a disarmament reform process—which is likely to end, if arms are around, in another debauch of war-insanity. I hold the English-speaking nations to blame. I have a right, for I have been English for centuries. When the English-speaking nations turned thumbs down to Total Disarmament, they committed the conspicuous tragic act of the drama.

Are there not others in the guilt? Of course, France, Japan, Poland, others, are sharers. But the English-speaking nations are the major sinners. At this hour, the power of control is chiefly in their hands. Nothing can be done without their approval. Practically any measure can be put through if they lead! The President of the Conference—the President of the General Commission—the Secretariat (where resides 50 percent of the power)—the two chief naval powers—the two richest nations—the farthest-flung empires—the best organized force for world propaganda for peace, in press, pulpit, lectures, etc.—*all from English-speaking nations. Whatever* comes out

of the Disarmament Conference at Geneva may be laid at the door of the English-speaking nations!

So, for the defeat of total disarmament, I put the chief blame on America, Britain, South Africa, Canada and Company. As English-speaking (in ancestry, for centuries) I put on deepest mourning. This coupled with great fear that, as it has always been, the "sceptre will be taken away"! The Great Avenger is no respecter of nations!

Let us confess it, English-speaking peoples—we have a bad record. (I am not unmindful of the glorious features—laws, freedom—all these I have been taught from my youth up.) But wherever we have gone carrying the Ten Commandments, our final appeal for possession has been the sword. For some centuries we have engaged in slave trade, and quoted our Bible to sanction it. We have swept across the American continent, across the African continent, across the Asiatic continent—not omitting the islands of the Great Seas, until the greater and better part of the earth is controlled by our flags—and in all this the sword has been the first and final appeal.

Let us confess it, English-speaking peoples, we have encircled the globe in our exploits. We have composed the best hymns, and also the best cannon, and they have been used by the same men! This terrible inconsistency we have seemed to be unconscious of. We possess Panama and Suez, Hawaii and Singapore, by the might of the sword. The Anglo-Saxon has the keys to practically all the doors of the world! So, when I hear the complaints against Japan (bad enough) I cannot listen easily, because mountain-high rise the sins of like kind of the English-speaking nations.

When I think of the Anglo-Saxon—my people—I tremble. What can be done to save this long-headed pioneer in the art of exploitation. One thing is certain—he must *repent,* this Jacob, "supplanter" of recent centuries. His hands are full of blood.

1. My people must *disarm.* They must actually do this, and not go through a show of doing it. They had a grand chance of doing it when the Great Peace Proposal was held before their eyes. If it comes again, they should grab it!

If we do not want to learn from Tolstoy, or Gandhi, or Kagawa—being too proud or too dull—let us turn to our matchless Scriptures, our own Jesus, and there in plain words (he that flies can read) the way of life for peoples, is shown for all nations (English-speaking not excluded) that the nation that takes the sword shall perish by the sword.

This Disarmament Conference is the great chance for the English-speaking nations of earth! It is their "day of salvation"! If they falter, compromise, hesitate—afraid to go in for the abolishment of war by the abolishment of arms—they will be listening to siren-voices that have ever drawn the mighty to destruction.

2. A second thing my people—the English-speaking nations—must do. They must begin to *restore* ill-gotten lands and properties. This will try their souls! We must begin to restore "concessions" wrested from nations which possessed them since the era of Moses, when stealing began to be reprehensible. If my people do not quickly begin to practice the *virtue* of distribution, equally with that of acquisition, we shall die of congestion of brain and heart and nerves. Sure!

Many of the deeds to lands and other properties made out in the name of Mars must be cancelled. The Political Commission under the General Commission must not overlook this aspect in the problem of disarmament! And, here again, the English-speaking nations—from Australia to Scotland—hold the best cards. What these nations *led in* would probably become the findings of the Conference!

This is our day—of opportunity, of vast responsibility!

We missed it terribly on February 25th—the great Day of Visitation—we must not continue in our blindness—blind leaders of the blind—but must stand for the principle of complete disarmament and restoration of just territorial lines! We must seek the salvation of the Anglo-Saxon, the chief "villain" of the disarmament drama, lest he be brought to destruction, and with him be drawn down half the world in ruin.

Geneva, Switzerland. SYDNEY STRONG.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Any City

Open your gates! O city of refuge!
Out of the distance a fugitive soul,
Fleeing the justice of sword, or of deluge,
Stumbles and faints within sight of the goal.

Give him to drink of your bitter, clear fountains,
Wipe from his forehead the sweat, darkly-brewed,
Show him the sun as it breaks on the mountains,
Bind up his woundings and offer him food.

Ask him no word of his home or his kindred,
Never a fact of his sin or his flight,
Let not forgetting and healing be hindered,
Where darkness brooded be only the light.

JESSIE WILMORE MURTON

Gold Seekers

Before a glittering god, aloof and cold,
They offer leisure; love; the stars of May.
And in return they walk a granite way
To triumph in a casket sealed with gold.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Smug Household

Sleek and fat,
The wife sits all day at the window,
Sleek and fat.

Slow and black,
The maid works all day in the kitchen,
Slow and black.

Jowled and gruff,
The husband smokes all day in the office,
Jowled and gruff.

Pale and silly,
The boy plays with paper dolls,
Pale and silly.

A household
Complacent, satisfied,
Contributing nothing
To the progress of the world.

HENRIETTE W. ROBERTS

They Worked at Your Side

You may build a great mill and call it your own
But you cannot buy men as you purchase stone.
They may offer their backs the long hours through
But it wasn't their souls that were bartered to you.

You may fashion a product that gives you pride
But never forget who worked at your side.
And remember when rivals enter the race
It is men and not beasts who must follow the pace.

HENRY E. SWENSEN

To a Poet

No truth so gripping as the deed
That levels every race and creed.

No beauty keener, or as bright,
Than people facing toward the light.

No greater value, flow and rhyme,
Than workers hewing out of Time.

A better world in which to see
The living forms of equity.

ISIDORE GOODMAN

The Conviction of a Vegetarian

I became a vegetarian about thirty-four years ago, to be exact, on April 10, 1898, after a visit to and inspection, with a guide, of the John P. Squire & Son slaughter house in East Cambridge. It is now called a packing house. It sounds better and makes us rest easier. I wish every meat-eater were obliged by law to visit one of these slaughter houses at regular intervals. Perhaps this thirty-five years' silence of mine, on the subject, will explain somewhat my sympathy and feeling of kinship toward the other dumb animals.

Furthermore, realizing that thirty-four additional years may elapse before this opportunity is again afforded me, I may possibly be excused for speaking plainly, but I trust honestly, even though I may offend you and cause you some personal discomfort. During the eleven years that I have been interested in the Community Church of Boston I have listened to its speakers pleading for the rights of all men and women, free speech, free assembly, justice, and the right to live and let live. But never, to my best recollection, barring one possible exception, have these many speakers made one appeal or said one word in defense of our fellow animal creatures whose lives and freedom mean perhaps as much to them as they do to each of us. If one would take the time to survey the history of civilized man and enumerate the unnecessary casualties incident to war, industry, amusement and the utter disregard of nature's simple laws of hygiene and self preservation, one would be inclined towards the conviction that the animal kingdom entertains a greater respect for life than does mankind.

In defense of this absence of consideration for the animal kingdom and especially the domesticated ones destined to serve man's needs and pleasures, it has been suggested at various times that there is so much to be done towards the solution of man's many problems that all other of this earth's living creatures must wait until man's affairs have been solved.

The question is frequently asked: What are they for anyway? This is probably what the cannibal said when admonished for eating the missionary. In all seriousness, can anyone intelligently state why any life exists upon this planet, or why man should occupy reserved seats upon the grandstand?

Perhaps the wise creator in his wisdom wished to have an outstanding parasite among the many lesser ones. An outstanding destroyer of life, of the forests in which they have their being, a destroyer of natural scenery, the beauty of nature and the pollution of streams and seas adjoining our shores. Man's substitutes for these are dark and gloomy streets, unbeautiful mills and factory buildings, slums, unwholesome dwellings and extensive areas of burned and denuded forest lands.

Surely the virtues of love, charity, justice, understanding, square dealing and the right to live and let live, cannot be segregated, partitioned and confined to any privileged few or group as a sort of measure of mutual reciprocity. Must not these virtues lose their own values if so treated. No philosophy could sanction such a point of view. It must be evident that the more intelligent and domesticated of the animal group do not recognize this distinction as evidenced by the loyalty and devotion of some animals towards man.

If food nourishes the mind, or its tissues, as well as the body in general, is it fair to expect people, carnivorous in their dietary habits, to successfully and completely rehabilitate themselves from the practices of the jungle from which man probably originally came, and has not yet traveled far from. The marked distinctive habit characteristics between the carnivorous and the herbivorous animals are well known. Which is to be the choice of the perfect mankind of our aspirations and struggles?

Many civilized people now straddle the fence with one foot on one side and the other on the opposite. Is it fair that we should handicap ourselves by these dietary practices, knowing the ethical as well as the dietary results of so doing.

As to man's priority over all living things, suppose we look about and survey this superior being in any large city. Let us note the many buildings whose doorways are adorned with the signs of doctors and others who would cure our ills. Let us note the many drug-stores, hospitals, clinics, sanitariums, asylums, almhouses, prisons, jails, police stations and soup kitchens, and consider the thousands of people confined within their walls, voluntarily and otherwise. And of the people still at large, note if you will the bald heads, wigs, eye-glasses, artificial teeth, painted lips and cheeks, canes, crutches, braces, the crippled and the deformed, the undernourished and overfed. Note the worried, care-worn expression upon their faces and in some instances the vulgarity and debasement so evident.

Note if you will the decorations with which these people adorn themselves, the jewelry, high heeled shoes, and the skins of animals emulating the wild man of prehistoric days. For furs alone, it is estimated that 10,000,000 animals are annually trapped, tortured and slaughtered. One coat alone may require 50 or more of these skins. These furs are worn presumably for warmth yet are about as stylish in summer as in winter and are sometimes worn short and at other times long as style dictates.

Examine the advertisements in our newspapers,

magazines and broadcasted over our radios, the countless drugs, nostrums, soaps, appliances, lamps, and belts, in a frantic endeavor to keep civilized man with a school girl complexion and up on his feet.

Compare all these evidences of man's civilization with the few animals in our neighborhood forests—those which have not yet become exterminated by the cruel trappers and hunters. Then ask yourself honestly and intelligently—Is civilized man entitled to that pedestal of superiority upon which he has placed himself and is he justified in exercising by cruel and uncompromising methods this self asserted superiority? There is perhaps some reason and intelligence in the statement of the person who said that the more he saw of man the better he liked his dog.

Sometimes when discouraged and depressed because of the social and economic injustices of our civilization, I find consolation in asking myself if man after all does not get out of life all or more than he puts in and perhaps fully as much as he deserves.

Time does not permit my going into the many details of the vegetarian philosophy but perhaps a few instances may be of interest. Let me call to your attention the many well known cruelties incidental to the cattle ranges with the brandings, emasculations, the freezing, starvation and thirst, especially in times of drought or storms and when the market price of meats does not warrant any considerable outlay for its amelioration; the long journeys on the crowded cattle trains exposed to the heat of summer and the cold in winter, to the cruel slaughter houses where economic considerations alone determine the methods of slaughter. Consider the men and women engaged in this work because of necessity and because most meat eaters would find the job too repulsive and revolting and would prefer that some less fortunate person, under dire necessity, do the job for them. I need not remind you of the records of crime and degradation incident to the workers in these huge centers of the slaughtering industry.

In England, I am told, there exists on the statute books a law preventing any butcher, by trade, from serving on a murder trial jury.

The production of non-carnivorous food is to any enlightened individual far more congenial and less repulsive than that of animal flesh.

The successful housewife must exercise methods of camouflage in the preparation of animal flesh but not so with the vegetarian diet.

Flesh foods are almost exclusively derived from herbivorous animals. The flesh of carnivorous animals is, in most cases, unfit for man's food.

A gracious host may with pride invite her guests' attention to a sunny well kept vegetable or fruit garden in view from the dining-room window, but never to the gruesome slaughter house hidden away in obscurity. A dish of fruit and nuts may ornament the serving table but never a plate of lambs tongues, pigs feet or calves' brains.

To quote from the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson, "You have just dined; and however scrupulously the slaughter house is concealed in a graceful distance of miles, there is complicity."

Let me remind you that practically always carnivorous animal kills for food only when hunger requires it, while man kills for accessory food or for sport or even in celebration of so-called religious holidays such as Thanksgiving Day or Christmas when stuffing feasts are in order and extra killings necessary. The carnivorous animals make no pretense of friendship, affection or protection towards their prey while man does all of these things and in the end slaughters and devours.

From an economic standpoint the high cost of flesh foods and the enormous accumulations of wealth by our meat packers ought at least be of some consideration especially in these times of depression and economic inequality. The amount of grazing land necessary for the feeding and growth of one meat producing animal would supply garden space for the raising of a vastly greater amount of food products.

A few of the medical aspects of vegetarianism may be of interest. While man automically and physiologically is capable of a mixed or omnivorous diet, bear in mind that the physical body is a biological product, capable of adaptability in time to existing environment. There is no doubt some reason and excuse for earlier mankind in adapting himself to a carnivorous diet because of the meager development of his mind, the absence of agricultural tools and a knowledge of agriculture, as well as control over drought, storm and the cold of winter. But the mind of man is not biological but develops from experience, reason and spirituality. Therefore should not the civilized man of the 20th century exercise some spiritual and ethical consideration over the food necessary for his sustenance and development?

The monkey and the chimpanzee, the nearest approach to man in the process of evolution, while equally omnivorous in their anatomical structure, subsist in their natural life upon a vegetarian diet exclusively. Perhaps we can learn something from them.

Man can live successfully upon a diet exclusively of animal food, but in order to do so must eat of all animal tissue, not exclusively of muscle tissue, and must eat at least a part of these tissues uncooked. These requirements are revolting to most normal persons. A vegetarian diet can supply in abundance all the requirements of the human body and one is not required to devour yeast cakes or degenerating milk bacteria with their unpleasant taste and odor in order to combat the decaying and putrifying residue of a flesh diet.

Probably the greatest dietary discovery in this century has been the action of the vitamin and its source in our food supply. The almost complete absence of the vitamin in the cooked flesh of animals is well known among the medical scientists. I would remind you that in Russia today the greatest social and economic revolution the world has ever seen is being conducted on a diet largely of cabbage soup and black bread.

Time will not permit me to name the long list of thinking men and women of the past and present who have been and are vegetarians. The two great bloodless social evolutionists, Tolstoy and Gandhi, were and are abstainers of animal flesh, the one in the freezing climate of Russia, the other in the torrid heat of India. George Bernard Shaw, the greatest of living English dramatists, and George Arliss of stage fame. Holy Scripture has called for the day when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together. And it is my desire to hasten the day when man and the beast may do likewise.

J. Walter Schirmer.

The Study Table

A Rabbi Turns Author

The first volume to come from the pen of Solomon B. Freehof is a highly condensed but most acceptable account of the life story and work of great men who have influenced religious thought in the world's history.* It includes the names of the most outstanding among those who have strengthened the position of the church or have sought to humanize religion by working within or without its precincts.

The plan of the author is to select the names of only five men from the number who crowd the pages of each religion's history; obviously a difficult task. It is less troublesome in the case of Judaism than in that of most of the world's foremost religions because Judaism does not readily idealize and never canonizes its heroes. In the author's words:

> Judaism is a tradition which aims at ethical self-discipline expressed in social law, the unceasing progress of mankind toward a warless world, the ennobling of human character in the calm pursuits of culture, the independence and development of the mind by clear reason and systematic thinking, the eagerness to adjust life and knowledge to the new circumstances of each new age.

The process whereby law was to become synonymous with this interpretation of Judaism began with the work of the greatest of Judaism's "immortals." To surrender magic for a real religion of reverence and worship, to make them feel, rather than to compel them to accept, a code of ethics new to the then existing world, so to shape a legal system that it might become a part of the people to practice it, all this was the doctrine which Moses taught the children of Israel in their wanderings through the wilderness. "To develop human law so that it shall increasingly express the highest idealism of society is a social ideal which springs from Moses."

Judaism's militant prophet, Isaiah, offered the world its second great ideal, that of world peace. "Even across the centuries to our own day his words have been powerful enough to disturb the plans of statesmen and to limit the armaments of nations. Whatever hope there is in the human heart that war will some day cease, has been implanted by Isaiah. . . . His vision will trouble the conscience of humanity" until peace is the watchword of all nations. The character which may well accompany peaceful life both for nations and for individuals is exemplified in the man whom Dr. Freehof chooses as the third picture in Israel's gallery, the meek, modest, simple and patient Hillel, who has been regarded by some as the model for Jesus of Nazareth. Following him in the list of Judaism's immortals is the philosopher-physician, Maimonides, to whom the Jew is indebted for the early effort to set aright the seeming contradiction between reason and tradition. His "Guide to the Perplexed" served as the model for the next outstanding Jewish religious personality, Moses Mendelsohn, who from its pages "acquired a taste for clear reasoning, a hunger for philosophy, and a vast curiousity for cultures other than Jewish. From him the Jew was to learn that Judaism was a system of ceremonials and ritual but not a set of dogmas; that it regulated the outward actions of daily life, but allowed the mind to philosophize at will; that it taught self-discipline in action and freedom of thought." With such an interpretation of his religion it became easy for the Jew to break down the walls of the ghetto and at the appropriate moment to take his place in the drama of the world.

This worldliness of the Jew is in strong contrast to the other-worldliness of Christianity. Whereas, for the Jew man and God are partners in the game of life, the orthodox Christian can approach God's throne only through the mediation of Jesus. Hence Paul, who lifted Christianity to a "world embracing religion," was the greatest immortal of the Christian Church. The great men who followed him, many like himself, transformed by a vision of holiness, strengthened from within the church which Paul founded. Augustine, with his profound knowledge of philosophy, Hildebrand with his ability to destroy the control which for a while feudalism gained over the church, Francis of Assissi, with his deep humility of spirit, and Martin Luther, revolting from the narrow Christian dogmas to found the more liberal Protestantism, are the five men whom Dr. Freehof selects as the torchbearers of Christianity.

It is difficult to write of Jesus as a religious genius since by so large a portion of men he is regarded as more than man. Jesus came from Jewish stock; he was educated as a Jew; he taught and preached Jewish law and ethics. Jew and Christian will agree that his was an outstanding personality, as the result of which he was able to take the messages of his teachers, clothe it in a language of his own, and give it a vitality and meaning greater even than that which the prophets in Israel were able to bring to it. Through his tremendous power over men he brought God nearer to them. "He made the Divine personal for myriads of worshippers, and posterity in gratitude has made his personality divine."

There is another group of men who in measure transcend in greatness even the geniuses of the world religions because they labored not to create new doctrines nor to assume leadership in old ones, but to promote the welfare of their people by such means as lay at hand. Such was Akhnaton in Egypt in the sixteen century B. C. Such was Asoka, who ruled over great domains in India in the third century B. C. Such was Marcus Aurelius, the great Roman emperor of the second post Christian century. Such was Constantine, who left paganism to enter Christianity just in time to save the church from great strife within its ranks.

In another chapter Dr. Freehof pays homage to five men who had the courage to repudiate the fables which they thought surrounded religion. Their idea was to compel men to think, a task which most people assiduously avoid; to ask questions, demanding that the answers should clear away doubt and point toward truth; for they believed that if man can know the truth he must follow it: and following the truth would lead to good. These men have done much "to establish the rights of reason and to encourage the development of independent judgment." Therein they differed from the men whom the world calls atheists. These real "stormers of heaven" made the effort to rid society of the religions they despised. They took out of religion its central figure, the Godhead, and substituted a human element for it. An atheist is often no less a religious hero than is a great religious man; therefore, Dr. Freehof records the contributions of "a group of men in whose eyes destructiveness of religious thought was

*"Stormers of Heaven," by Solomon B. Freehof. Published by Harper & Brothers.

only a manifestation of constructive social idealism. They were willing to spend their energy to prove the non-existence of God because they felt that the belief in God was a hindrance to progress."

"Stormers of Heaven" is a kaleidoscopic view of the men who have made religious history for mankind. It is a guide to the names of the outstanding personalities in the various divisions of religious thought. It may succeed in sending some of its readers to more comprehensive studies of these "immortals" and the times in which they lived; for other readers it will prove a well prepared and satisfactory review of one of the most interesting and controversial fields of thought.

JENNIE FRANKLIN PURVIN.

Parables and Sayings

The death of Kahlil Gibran on April 10, 1931, was a loss alike to letters and to art. A rarely sensitive soul, a dreamer of the East caught by the love of beauty and the inner sense of mystic vision, he had written several books which revealed poetic and spiritual genius of a high order. Of these, "The Prophet" has won the widest approval and is unquestionably the best—a masterpiece of its kind!

This last volume,* completed by Gibran just before his lamentable death, does not quite come off. The drawings, so often compared to those of Blake, have all the chaste loveliness of the artist's earlier work. The parables are unfailingly simple and serene, occasionally noble and august, in style. For Gibran was a true poet! But the little stories, or scenes, lack point. They have no pungency or "bite." Frequently the idea is not clearly seen, or, if seen, is not clearly conveyed. One has only to compare this book with Olive Schreiner's "Dreams," the one masterpiece of this type in modern literature, to understand why Gibran's work so often fails. None the less, the book has beauty, and, if only for the sake of its great author, should be read.

J. H. H.

*"The Wanderer," by Kahlil Gibran. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. $2.00.

Correspondence

"Declaration of an American Citizen"

Editor of UNITY:

Althought I myself signed "The Declaration of an American Citizen" the moment it appeared, after further thought and discussion, I am inclined to believe that action was ill-considered and to question the merit of an out-and-out repudiation of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Macintosh case, as set forth in the following excerpt from the Declaration:

> "Therefore, I, a citizen of the United States, solemnly refuse to acknowledge the obligation which the Supreme Court declares to be binding upon all citizens, whether native-born or naturalized. I have not promised, expressly or tacitly, to accept an act of Congress as the final interpretation of the will of God, and I will not do so. In my allegiance to my country I withhold nothing, not even my life. But I can not give my conscience. That belongs to God. I repudiate the obligation which the Supreme Court's decision would impose upon me, and declare that the imposition of such an obligation is the essence of tyranny. I refuse to be bound by it."

No democracy can exist without regard for certain rules of the game, and under the present rules of American government, the decision of the majority is to be held as binding. That this rule, however, may under no circumstances whatsoever be disregarded, I should hesitate to contend. In the present issue of the State vs. the individual conscience, the Court of Appeals reversed the decision of a lower court in two instances on the grounds that "the rights of conscience are inalienable rights which a citizen need not surrender." This decision was in turn reversed by a five-to-four decision of the Supreme Court, notable for the solid line-up of all the liberal judges, including the Chief Justice, in the minority opinion. By such a decision, effectually abolishing the right of individual conscience and overriding the fundamental principle of Protestantism, it becomes a nice question whether indeed the government has not inflicted upon us the "essence of tyranny" which every citizen is justified in repudiating.

Of the two evils, however, the repudiation of the rules of the game probably would be the greater, especially since by those very rules this tyrannous ruling of the Supreme Court may be corrected.

Therefore, we did not feel justified in submitting "The Declaration of an American Citizen" to our church as a means for registering our protest to Congress, but prepared the following petition, which was offered to our congregation at the conclusion of a sermon, "Shall the State Dictate Our Conscience?", and signed by forty-odd members. (See below!)

We believe this petition is more in harmony with democratic principles than "The Declaration of an American Citizen" and offer it by way of example as one means of working for the retrieval of our individual right of conscience under the American government.

Very respectfully yours,

EUGENE W. SUTHERLAND
Minister Clifton Unitarian Church.
Louisville, Kentucky

[Petition]

Acknowledging fully the legality and binding force upon all American citizens of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Macintosh case to the effect that native as well as naturalized citizens owe "unqualified allegiance to the nation and submission and obedience to the laws of the land, as well those made for war as those made for peace," we yet herewith make use of our constitutional right as American citizens to petition Congress to change or amend the existing laws of the United States which define the duties of citizens in time of war, in such a way that they may conform to the principles expressed so aptly by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes with concurrence of Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Stone, when they wrote in the dissenting opinion:

"In the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the state has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would unquestionably be made by many of our conscientious and law-abiding citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation . . . One can not speak of religious liberty with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God."

As an immediate measure for amending the naturalization law, we endorse and urge the enactment of the Griffin Bill (H. R. 297), providing that

"No person mentally, morally and otherwise qualified shall be debarred from citizenship by reason of his or her religious views or philosophical opinions with respect to the lawfulness of war as a means of settling international disputes, but every alien admitted to citizenship shall be subject to the same obligations as the native-born citizen."

(Signed) .....

For Norman Thomas

Editor of UNITY:

If ever the country was tired of the old political parties it is now. If ever it needed a strong Socialist leadership it is now. A few months ago I read a fine article in UNITY by Norman Thomas that diagnosed our

disease and gave the clear cut remedy as Socialism. Why are you not rooting for him for President? Tell the people who he is anyway. I myself do not know anything about him. I wonder why the people by the millions do not flock to the Socialist standard.

E. T. GUEST

Silver Creek, N. Y.

Money and Debts

Editor of UNITY:

We hear it frequently said that changed economic conditions will necessitate a new adjustment of war debts due us from foreign nations. Why do we hear no talk of adjustment with home debtors on account of changed economic conditions? Is it because we can foreclose on the latter, but not being able to foreclose on the former we decide graciously to make an adjustment?

We can be more charitable and say that we have been so busy discussing the foreign debt situation that the situation at home has received scant attention. Yet it is of tremendous significance. There are over $9,000,000,000 of farm mortgages now in force here, and the decline in prices has so reduced the debt-paying ability of the farmer that the burden of these debts has more than doubled in seven years. What is true of the farm situation is true in a high degree of most producing industries, which are carried on so largely with borrowed capital.

President Hoover apparently believes that the operation of his Reconstruction Finance Corporation will so stimulate industry that even farm prices will rise. But we have yet to see a rise in crop or other commodity prices as a result of increased credit facilities. The $14,000,000,000 of additional credit put out by the banks between 1922 and 1929, which helped to boost stock prices to the skies, did not raise commodity prices perceptibly. We need to remember that prices of commodities (meaning raw materials), are international except for differences due to tariffs and transportation, and are governed by the world gold supply.

What help, then, is promised the greatest of all producing classes, the farmers? Congress at the President's request is preparing to establish land banks to make additional loans, as Will Rogers says, to those who have borrowed too much already. It may help to carry them along for a time. But what farmer can pay off mortgages with grain that sells at scarcely more than cost of production? Moreover, these loans are to be made only on gilt-edge security. The hundreds of thousands whose equities have been virtually wiped out by the fall of prices are to be left to their fate, apparently.

In the east it is being said that the agitation for bimetallism is largely an effort to boost the silver mining industry. What if this were true? The answer would be that many of those people who lift their hands in horror at the thought of a law which incidentally would raise the price of silver, will stop at nothing to secure tariff laws whose main purpose and result are to raise the prices of manufactured goods.

Yet if its chief purpose was to help the silver mining industry, bimetallism would have a meager following. Its real purpose and justification are centered in the need for a more stable monetary standard—a standard that will prevent such a drastic decline in prices as we have seen in recent years, with its resulting depression and hardship for a vast majority of the people. Economists are now well agreed that the price decline and depression are largely due to a world scarcity of gold. If this were not true we would hardly see all gold standard countries affected in the same way at the same time.

Would it not be good business and good morals to adopt a money system which would enable both foreign and domestic debtors to pay their debts with dollars of near the same value as those they borrowed, and which would give us a more stable standard of value and thus help to prevent future depressions?

F. S. KINDER

Denver, Colorado

Ireland and India

Editor of UNITY:

The increased Republican vote in Ireland seems to be due largely to resentment against the extremely high-handed measures taken by the government of the Irish Free State to put down the movement for a republic. William Burns' letter in a recent *Herald* is illuminating, and other press correspondents have thrown still further light on the subject.

In India, the ordinances which the Viceroy refused to discuss with Gandhi were patterned after those in Ireland, but they go still further. These are some of their points:

The government is empowered to requisition any property, movable or immovable, without compensation to the owner.

It may impose collective punishment upon a whole community for offences committed by individuals.

Blanket authority is given to local governments to "take such action as they think necessary."

No civil or criminal proceedings may be brought against any one for any action taken "or purporting to be taken" under these ordinances.

As in Ireland, special tribunals are set up for trying political offences; all the safeguards are removed which have usually been thought necessary to insure an accused person a fair trial; and no appeal is allowed.

When resentment against these ordinances led to a boycott of British industries, the Viceroy issued another series of ordinances, even more extreme, making practically every form of peaceful protest a penal offence.

In Ireland a dozen associations have been outlawed, including some whose work was perfectly legitimate, like the Irish women's society for the relief of political prisoners. In India the Viceroy has outlawed more than 500 organizations, including such innocent ones as spinning schools and "anti-drink societies." In Ireland there are said to be 40 political prisoners. In India there are thousands. And what is the result? In Ireland, De Valera is elected head of the state. In India, a press dispatch to the New York *Times* says, the government is having great trouble with the nationalist movement; the boycott of British goods has grown "very severe" and even the children in the schools are becoming disaffected.

Extreme and violent repression is not the wisest way to deal with people who think they have a grievance.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL

Boston, Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

cold blood, and beat him on the ground while in a state of unconsciousness, as I saw done by the police on this occasion. Even the most abject criminal can claim protection by the police force until the law inflicts its punishment. What justification is there then for these brutal attacks on our fellow citizens? Such sights are unfortunately of almost daily occurrence in every large town throughout India. Is it surprising that the prestige of Great Britain has gone and that the vast majority of the population now view the claims of Gandhi and the Congress sympathetically?

No fair reports of such cases are permitted in any newspaper, no chance of a just trial is possible, no permission is allowed to hold protest meetings: no public enquiry is conducted. Such suppression of a nation has alienated British feeling entirely throughout India. Let Great Britain cease brutality and open up negotiations for a mutual and amicable settlement of India's just claims with those who have become India's mouth-piece before it is too late and India follows America and claims her complete independence.

Agree or Perish

The intelligentsia cannot greatly help the indigentsia while they themselves are suffering from ataxia. They must be able to coordinate their own voluntary movements before they can move the minds of the masses.

Liberals must reach an agreement concerning the fundamental changes to be made in the existing social and economic order before they can win converts. They cannot convince the people if they cannot convince each other. They must get that way themselves before they can expect Republicans and Democrats to vote that way. Progressives must be as one big family in order to bring forth the next generation of causes.

Hitherto any attempt to align liberals on a program for the new world has proved abortive. The League for Independent Political Action is now

preparing a plan to be submitted to the country about January 18. They have asked for suggestions concerning the following major problems: Unemployment; money, banking and credit; taxation and the tariff; agriculture; civil liberties, including equal rights and the problem of prohibition; power; international relations.

More power to them! And money and credit and liberty and whatever else is needed to overcome unemployment.

All Liberals, Progressives, Radicals, Socialists, Reds and Communists should be able to unite upon a minimum agenda for the revolution. Here is an independent declaration in the form of a questionnaire for introspection:

Six Speedy Specifics

1. Should the Republican and Democratic parties be abjured at every election?
2. In the industrial conflict is labor entitled to consideration before capital?
3. Should natural resources such as coal, iron, oil and water power be owned by the government representing the people?
4. Will national armaments provoke war rather than promote peace?
5. Do you approve of freedom of speech, press and assembly in order that anyone may obtain whatever information is available upon any subject whatsoever?
6. Is the consensus of knowledge a more practical guide for modern life than ancient scriptures or personalities?

If any reader feels inclined to answer one or more of these questions in the negative, he should select a jury from the peers of liberalism and defend his opinions if he can.

—*The Arbitrator.*

What Gandhi Wants for India

And What His Influence Means in the Western World

By Linley V. Gordon

(Mr. Gordon, who is extension secretary of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, met the great exponent of "soul-force" just before Mr. Gandhi left England.)

He has been called a variety of names. Some say he is a seditionist, an ostentatious pietist, an Eastern Uriah Heep, an advertiser, a poseur, a bluff, a humbug, a sham, a crook, a putty saint. Others call him a mystic saint, an idealist, a liberator, a mahatma. The preponderance of bad things said of Gandhi comprises the verdict of the white trader in India. It is a commercial, militarist, imperialist judgment.

One thing is certain, namely, that the people of India on the whole are with him in his efforts to free India. Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Parsees, love him. Millions follow him. He is perhaps the most important man now alive.

What does he want? Freedom. *Swaraj.* That is the word that has seized the mind of India. India desires liberty. Other nations have it. She feels she should have it, too.

Does Gandhi desire liberty within the British Empire? Yes, if possible. The Nationalists have a slogan:

With England if she will,
Without her if she won't.

That is the way Gandhi feels. It is his position. He wants to be an equal partner in the British Empire.

What does freedom involve for India? For one thing, it means control of the army. Speaking to the Federal Structure Committee in London on November 17, he said: "The nation which has no control over its defense forces is not a responsible nation; and, if the British people think it will be a century before we can be trusted with control of the army, then for that century the National Congress will wander in the wilderness. If India can not have control over the army, then the army should be disbanded. I will wait until eternity if I can not get control over the national defenses."

The second element involved in freedom is control of finances. The Nationalists feel that they will never be satisfied with any political status the constitution may provide if financial control is not transferred to the Indian legislature.

The third feature in the program for independence calls for control of foreign affairs.

If these things can be obtained within the Empire, Gandhi will cease his civil-disobedience campaign. If not, he will probably continue agitation.

What objections are raised against granting India dominion status? The first charge is that if England gives freedom to India, the Hindus and Moslems will fight. That has been said scores of thousands of times. It makes no impression on the Indian mind, however. The Indian people know that if the right of self-government was contingent upon the ability to live in peace with one another, the professing Christian nations would be disqualified. They know that the white nations have been at each other's throats in many wars waged since the days of Constantine. They know that from 1914 to 1918 not only men of different religions, but men of the same religion, fought each other, namely, the Christian religion. Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Methodists, Universalists, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Anglicans, Episcopalians, Catholics, all went to the human slaughter-house.

Ten million boys were slain, professedly Christian boys; twenty-five million others were maimed or crippled.

Who are the representatives of the governments in Christendom that they should turn and say to Hindus and Moslems: "You are not capable of self-government. If we left you to yourselves, you would kill one another"? That argument makes no dent in the mind of millions of Indians. If the ability to live at peace is to be the acid test of national independence, then what nation would merit independence?

Christian Endeavor World

Sydney Strong Back from Geneva

After six months spent in Europe, in Moscow and Geneva, Dr. Strong arrived in New York at Easter time to remain until May (address Hotel Wolcott, 4 West 31st). He will then take a trip to the coast and will be ready to do "some speaking."

Recognition for Dr. Sunderland

The India Community of New York City commemorated the 90th birthday of Dr. J. T. Sunderland (February 11, 1932) by presenting him with a beautiful loving cup, finely inscribed, in recognition of his service to India.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year
In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government
SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 13 — ISSUES 20c
STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison. Wis.

Back Up the Poetry Editors of UNITY, LUCIA TRENT and RALPH CHEYNEY
by buying their new joint book:
DREAMERS' HOUSE
SAID OF THIS BOOK:
"A bright, brave book!"—E. Mirick.
"A unique book by two of America's most lovable poets."—A. M. Stephens.
SAID OF THEIR PREVIOUS BOOKS:
"Lucia Trent need not write another line to make certain her shining immortality." The English Journal. "Final evidence of poetic genius," John Haynes Holmes.
"What I call poetry," Robert Frost. "There is the burning heart of life in your verses." Wm. Ellery Leonard.
Foreword by Glenn Ward Dresbach. Publisher: Robert Packard & Co., Chicago.
$1.60 postpaid
Order, autographed, from its authors at
259 SOUTH 44th ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876